

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toshiyuki et al. (JP 2001-210123).

Claims 5, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshiyuki et al.

The Specification is objected to for a minor informality.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended the Specification, and amended claims 1 and 2 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are pending for consideration.

Applicants concurrently includes herewith an English-language translation of Toshiyuki et al. obtained from the Japanese Patent Office website.

**Objection to the Specification**

The Specification is objected to for a minor informality. Specifically, the Specification is objected to for not including a statement regarding continuing data regarding the present application. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Specification to include identification of the related PCT patent application. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the Specification, as presently amended, contains no informalities, and respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toshiyuki et al. (JP 2001-210123), and claims 5, 8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshiyuki et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the combination of features of at least independent claim 1, as amended.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a plate-shaped light guide including, in part, a light guide having “a finely uneven surface, and average slant angle  $\theta_a$  of the finely uneven surface is in a range of  $0.3^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$  *with uniform distribution across the major part of the light emitting face*, and a ten-point average roughness  $R_z$  is in a range of  $0.7\ \mu\text{m}$  to  $10\ \mu\text{m}$  *with uniform distribution across the major part of the light emitting face*,” (emphasis added). In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, and as explicitly disclosed in the enclosed English-language translation of Toshiyuki et al., the light exiting face 12 of light guide plate 10 has a *non-uniform distribution* of arithmetic mean granularity. Specifically, Toshiyuki et al. explicitly teaches, in Drawings 5-8 and paragraphs [0028] to [0036], that the arithmetic mean granularity increases as it gets further away from the light source.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied prior art reference neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-10.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 29, 2006

**Customer No. 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202-739-3000